|    | Page 1                         |
|----|--------------------------------|
| 1  | UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT |
| 2  | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK  |
| 3  | Case No. 08-01789(BRL)         |
| 4  | Adv. Case No. 08-01789(BRL)    |
| 5  | x                              |
| 6  | In the Matter of:              |
| 7  |                                |
| 8  | SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION |
| 9  | CORPORATION,                   |
| 10 |                                |
| 11 | Debtor.                        |
| 12 | x                              |
| 13 | SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION |
| 14 | CORPORATION,                   |
| 15 | Plaintiff,                     |
| 16 | v.                             |
| 17 | BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT   |
| 18 | SECURITIES, LLC, et al.,       |
| 19 | Defendants.                    |
| 20 | x                              |
| 21 |                                |
| 22 |                                |
| 23 | U.S. Bankruptcy Court          |
| 24 | One Bowling Green              |
| 25 | New York, New York             |

Page 3 1 Hearing re: (cc-5491) Eleventh Application of Windels Marx 2 Lane & Mittendorf, LLP for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 3 4 Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through 5 April 30, 2012 for Windels Marx Lane & Mittendorf, LLP, 6 Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fees: 7 \$1,629,622.00, expenses: \$9,539.18 8 9 Hearing re: (cc-5502) Application of Werder Vigano as 10 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim 11 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 12 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Werder Vigano, Special Counsel, 13 14 period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$5,792.27, expenses: \$0 15 16 Hearing re: (cc-5503reenfield Stein & Senior, LLP as 17 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 18 19 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 20 through April 30, 2013 for Greenfield Stein & Senior, LLP, 21 Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: 22 \$2,270.25, expenses: \$25.65 23 24 Hearing re: (cc-5504) Application of Browne Jacobson, LLP 25 as Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim

Page 4 1 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 2 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 3 through April 30, 2013 for Browne Jacobson, LLP, Special 4 Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$214,820.72, 5 expenses: \$35,148.00 6 Hearing re: (cc-5505) Application of Eugene F. Collins as 7 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim 8 9 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 10 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 11 through April 30, 2013 for Eugene F. Collins, Special 12 Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$1,397.62, 13 expenses: \$0.00 14 15 Hearing re: (cc-5506) Application of Kugler Kandestein, LLP 16 as Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim 17 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 18 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Kugler Kandestein, Special 19 20 Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$982.24, 21 expenses: \$4.98 22 Hearing re: (cc-5490) Twelfth Application of Trustee and 23 24 Baker & Hostetler LLP for Allowance of Interim Compensation 25 for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and

Page 5 1 Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through 2 April 30, 2013 for Baker & Hostetler, LLP, Trustee's 3 Attorney, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$46775739.15, 4 expenses: \$1,347,334.97 5 6 Hearing re: (cc-5507) Application of Ritter & Ritter 7 Advokatur as Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement 8 9 of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from January 15, 10 2013 through April 30, 2013 for Ritter & Ritter Advokatur, Special Counsel, period: 1/15/2013 to 4/30/2013, fee: 11 12 \$70,665.70, expenses: \$44.56 13 Hearing re: (cc-5492) Application of Schiltz & Schiltz as 14 15 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim 16 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 17 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Schiltz & Schiltz, Special 18 Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$66,279.97, 19 20 expenses: \$4,308.20 21 Hearing re: (cc-5493) Application of Higgs & Johnson 22 23 (formerly Higgs Johnson Truman Bodden & Co.) as Special 24 Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation 25 for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and

Page 6 1 Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through 2 April 30, 2013 for Higgs & Johnson (formerly Higgs Johnson 3 Truman Bodden & Co.), Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$33,237.00, expenses: \$900.65 4 5 6 Hearing re: (cc-5494) Application of Soroker - Agmon as 7 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 8 9 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 10 through April 30, 2013 for Soroker - Agmon, Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$398,386.25, expenses: 11 12 \$9,883.93 13 Hearing re: (cc-5495) Application of Graf & Pitkowitz 14 15 Rechtsanwalte GmbH as Special Counsel to the Trustee for 16 Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and 17 Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Graf & Pitkowitz 18 Rechtsanwalte GmbH, Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 19 20 4/30/2013, fee: \$642,544.02, expenses: \$76,918.91 21 22 Hearing re: (cc-5496) Application of SCA Creque as Special 23 Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and 24 25 Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through

Page 7 1 April 30, 2013 for SCA Creque, Special Counsel, period: 2 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$5,590.05, expenses: \$174.50 3 4 Hearing re: (cc-5497) Application of Young Conaway Stargatt 5 & Taylor, LLP as Special Counsel to the Trustee for 6 Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and 7 Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Young Conaway 8 9 Stargatt & Taylor, LLP, Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 10 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$38,026.35, expenses: \$1,401.38 11 12 Hearing re: (cc-5498) Application of Williams, Barristers & 13 Attorneys as Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement 14 15 of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 16 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Williams, Barristers & 17 Attorneys, Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$159,419.08, expenses: \$0.00 18 19 20 Hearing re: (cc-5499) Application of Taylor Wessing as 21 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim 22 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 23 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 24 through April 30, 2013 for Taylor Wessing, Special Counsel, 25 period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$5,825,888.90,

Page 8 1 expenses: \$3,250,037.23 2 3 Hearing re: (cc-5508) Application of Bedell Cristin Guernsey Partnership as Special Counsel to the Trustee for 4 5 Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and 6 Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from 7 April 5, 2013 through April 30, 2013 for Bedell Cristin Guernsey Partnership, Special Counsel, period: 4/5/2013 to 8 9 4/30/2013, fee: \$7,851.97, expenses: \$27.56 10 Hearing re: (cc-5500) Application of UGGC & Associes as 11 12 Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim 13 Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 14 Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 15 through April 30, 2013 for UGGC & Associes, Special Counsel, 16 period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$175,812.50, expenses: 17 \$717.59 18 Hearing re: (cc-5509) Application of Munari Giudici 19 20 Maniglio Panfili E Associati as Special Counsel to the 21 Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services 22 Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from March 21, 2013 through April 30, 2013 for 23 24 Munari Giudici Maniglio Panfili E Associati, Special 25 Counsel, period: 3/21/2013 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$2,651.72,

Page 9 expenses: \$0.00 Hearing re: (cc-5501) Application of Triay Stagnetto Neish as Special Counsel to the Trustee for Allowance of Interim Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of Actual and Necessary Expenses Incurred from December 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013 for Triay Stagnetto Neish, Special Counsel, period: 12/1/2012 to 4/30/2013, fee: \$99,982.03, expenses: \$4,035.89 Transcribed by: Dawn South

```
Page 10
    APPEARANCES:
1
    BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
2
         Attorney for the Trustee
3
4
         45 Rockefeller Plaza
5
         New York, NY 10111-0100
6
7
    BY: DAVID J. SHEEHAN, ESQ.
8
9
    WINDELS MARX LANE & MITTELDORF, LLP
10
         156 West 56th Street
         New York, NY 10019
11
12
13
    BY: ALAN NISSELSON, ESQ.
14
15
   SPIC
16
         805 15th Street, N.W.
17
         Suite 800
18
         Washington, D.C. 20005-2215
19
20
    BY: KEVIN H. BELL, ESQ.
21
22
23
24
25
```

Page 11 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Second call. 3 THE COURT: SIPC v. BLMIS. MR. SHEEHAN: Good morning, Your Honor. How are 4 5 you today? 6 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Sheehan. 7 MR. SHEEHAN: The -- this is the twelfth interim fee application of the trustee together with his other 8 counsel, conflict counsel, Windels Marx and Young Conaway, 9 10 as well as an assortment, as Your Honor knows, of foreign 11 counsel who are also seeking reimbursements this morning. 12 There is no objection to any of the applications before Your Honor today, but as I have done in the past, 13 14 what I would like to do, if I may, and very briefly, is to 15 outline the work that has been done by the international 16 counsel in the reporting period before I actually submit the 17 order to Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Sure. MR. SHEEHAN: We actually have some new counsel 19 20 here this morning. The first one is the Munari firm in 21 Italy. We've retained that firm in connection with several 22 matters. One is the action that we've instituted against 23 UniCredit, which of course is the largest bank in Italy, and 24 they're assisting us with regard to a variety of issues, mainly related to discovery and in assistance to the freeze 25

order that we obtained against Sonja Cohen in the United Kingdom.

The next firm is the Bedell firm, this is in the Isle of Guernsey. This is a new retention by us in connection with work that we've begun there. Certain of the defendants actually are incorporated there. We've begun service of process and instituted proceedings there and utilized our Guernsey counsel.

Ritter & Ritter is in Liechtenstein, they have been working for us for some time.

As Your Honor knows there are a number of matters in Liechtenstein, one of which involves an investor with regard to the Sonja Cohen matter. There we have a freeze with regard to about \$2 million that we have found there, and the Liechtenstein prosecutor has worked with us to maintain that freeze.

We are pursuing avenues of discovery there, and Ritter & Ritter assists us with both of those efforts.

Eugene Collins is in Ireland. In Ireland we have the Thema (ph) matter, which we did not participate in. We elected not to for a variety of reasons.

That case, as Your Honor probably recalls, settled for about \$250 million. That was brought by the Thema investors against HSBC.

We have worked out an arrangement, that money is

Page 13 1 currently sitting on hold until we resolve our differences 2 with HSBC or at least reach an accommodation as to the 3 disposition of those funds. 4 Collins has assisted us with regard to that 5 effort. 6 Schiltz & Schiltz is in Luxembourg. 7 Luxembourg is where we have an action actually instituted, as Your Honor may recall, against the trustee 8 9 language with a number of other individuals. We brought a 10 motion, as Your Honor will recall, to enjoin that action 11 here. It was removed before Judge Raykoff and is currently 12 pending before him, and we have before Your Honor an issue 13 with regard to personal jurisdiction, which of course is 14 still being briefed and litigated in this court. Schiltz & Schiltz works with us on all of those 15 16 matters, but in addition to that we are also again pursuing 17 this freeze order against Sonja Cohen in the Luxembourg 18 courts because there are assets that she has there as well. Kugler & Kandestein is in Canada, that's a very 19 20 limited retention, it seeks only three hours. That's only 21 in connection with some discovery. 22 THE COURT: Isn't Sonja Cohen also Austria? 23 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, there is, and I'll get to that in a minute, Your Honor. 24 25 THE COURT: Oh, okay.

MR. SHEEHAN: Higgs & Johnson is the Cayman Islands.

As Your Honor will recall many of the feeder funds created to feed the Bernie Madoff fraud were in fact located in the Cayman Islands, and later I'll speak about BDI.

In Cayman we've had an interesting array of matters that have transpired there, principally orbiting around whether or not the trustee has jurisdiction. We fought that in the Premio (ph) matter -- or Premaio (ph) -- and in Premaio we had success with the court there in enforcing and going forward with our order. That is now currently on appeal.

Our adversaries are still taking the position that we cannot appear there and actually prosecute the causes of action.

As Your Honor knows we filed causes of action here with Your Honor but we filed protective actions in Cayman, the UK, BDI, Bermuda, and a number of other jurisdictions just in case we ran into either personal jurisdiction or other jurisdictional problems, but we are actively pursuing this there and we've had, as I say, success to date, and that is what Higgs & Johnson is principally assisting us with, although there are other jurisdictional issues that they've assisted on us as well.

Soroker & Agmon in Israel, that is the Magnify

matter. That is a matter where as Your Honor recalls from the complaint that we filed here that approximately \$130 million of fictitious profits went to Magnify. Magnify then became the principal donor to an alleged charitable organization known as Shasia Horowitz (ph) in Israel. That money then was subsequently transferred out to a number of other institutions.

We have been participating there in the -- there was an immediate after our filing of a complaint I should say -- Shasia Horowitz immediately filed to liquidate without disclosing the fact that they'd been sued as part of the Magnify action.

We then went into the courts in Israel through
Soroker and notified the Court of what was transpiring, they
then withdrew their liquidation.

We are now in the process of having a receiver appointed through the Israeli courts with the idea of utilizing that vehicle to find the assets and trace them through the Shasia Horowitz transfers.

There's been some discovery here. Your Honor will recall Soroker also assisted us with that, because that was a deposition that we ended up actually taking in Switzerland of the attorney who created the Magnify Shasia Horowitz combination.

It's a very fascinating story that we've managed

to pull together, but what we still have not unraveled, quite frankly, is the fact that there's \$130 million in fictitious profits and they went through Shasia Horowitz and into the hands of a man named Israel Greene (ph), who we've also sued, and a good deal of those monies then went interest the Greene family. We're also pursuing those.

So that one case alone has generated very significant activity on behalf of the trustee. But because of the magnitude, as is always the case in Madoff, the \$130 million, we're actively pursuing that in Israel more so than we are here because that's where we think all the assets are.

Graf & Pitkowitz, that's Austria as Your Honor mentioned a moment ago.

That is the place where Sonja Cohen created, as
Your Honor will recall, Bank Medichi (ph). Bank Medichi was
the principal vehicle she created to create a feeder fund -a number of feeder funds. Bank Medichi then created
investment vehicles, four or five of them that were
supposedly, you know, diversified or fixed income, et
cetera. None of them really existed. They were just
fabrications created by her. They then all fed all their
money into Mr. Madoff. She over the course of time brought
in about \$9 billion into the Madoff fraud.

We have sued her, Bank Medichi, and a number of

other individuals here in the United States. We have not started a lawsuit there. What we have been doing is cooperating with the prosecutor.

As Your Honor knows there's a little different system in Europe. We can actually participate. The trustee is viewed as the victim in those proceedings. We can participate and have participated and given them documents and assistance, them being the prosecutor, it's a criminal action, and that criminal action we can participate in by being in the room with witnesses who are interviewed or depositions take place, and we've actively participated in those as well.

Graf & Pitkowitz is our firm that's worked with us throughout that. There has been an enormous amount of information that's been forthcoming. That prosecution is nearing its head. We believe that certainly, although not in the reporting period, but more recently it has, so that we believe by the end of this year, the beginning of next, there will be an active prosecution of the principal defendants, including Mrs. Cohen in that action.

THE COURT: Isn't she also involved in the UK proceedings?

MR. SHEEHAN: She is. I'm going to get to that one in a minute as well. But yes, she is. She's a principal defendant there and we had a trial this summer,

08-01789-cgm Doc 5553 Filed 10/18/13 Entered 10/25/13 10:35:33 Main Document Pq 18 of 36 Page 18

which I'll talk about in a moment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And they were adverse to her findings? MR. SHEEHAN: Well, there were adverse findings against Mrs. Cohen with regard to the freeze order, which was about 18 months ago.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. SHEEHAN: But we're still waiting for the decision of Judge Popplewell. I used to think as an aside that Thickens made those names up, but they actually just exist in England.

But in any event, Judge Popplewell is sitting there on that decision. We should have it I think next week.

SCA Creque is the Switzerland -- I'm sorry - BDI counsel that we've had working for us. Not much activity during the reporting period.

BDI has gone somewhat quite in the sense that most of the activity is taking place, as Your Honor as noted, in the United kingdom, Austria, Cayman, and obviously in this courthouse, but they do of course assist us, because there are number of (indiscernible - 00:14:14) such as Kinggate (ph), which is active principally in Bermuda though, which is the next firm, that's the Williams Barrister firm.

In Bermuda what is occurring is this. As you know we've been negotiating at length with the liquidators in

Kinggate to try to resolve that matter. It broke out into litigation with DBSI and Kinggate in the federal courts here. There's been a delay principally because there has to be some resolution of the remission fund, which has not yet taken place with the special master. We're hoping that will happen shortly, and that'll give us guidance as to how we can deal with that distribution.

But in the meantime what's going on is KML,

Kinggate Management Limited, is operating in Bermuda and

they were one of the management funds created by the

ultimate architects of this fraud, the Kinggate fraud,

Suretti & Grosso (ph), who we've sued both here and in the

United Kingdom. Those lawsuits are pending.

But we sued them also in Bermuda and there's an action there also by the liquidators that had been on hold while we were discussing things. But since things aren't moving they've started to move, therefore we've become much more active there seeking to shut down the liquidator cause of action in favor of the trustee's cause of action. That's being currently litigated in the courts.

We have an agreement with the receiver, there are many parties here, the receiver for Kinggate Management

Limited was actually appointed in Bermuda, the liquidators are from BDI, and we're here from the United States. We're all in the Bermuda court.

We're cooperating with the receiver and we will ultimately I think resolve all this once we have guidance from special master on that aspect of it, because we've virtually worked out all the details with the rest of the settlement.

Taylor Wessing is our counsel in England. You can see they have significant time, over 17,000 hours.

What was happening during the reporting period was essentially the discovery that took place with regard to the cause of action Your Honor eluded to, the defendants in that action are the directors of MSIL, which was the corporation created by Mr. Madoff in furtherance of his fraud, there was an instrumentality of the fraud. He presented it as a foreign body that was utilized by him to create trades in the European market thereby justifying that he was operating in dark pools of liquidity, as he called it, so that therefore the volatility that otherwise would have manifested itself on the exchange did not because he used it. Of course it was all a lie and MSIL was a fraud.

The activities that were limited to proprietary trading on his behalf we have during the course of this discovery we discovered not only a number of documents supporting our case but actual phone conversations between Mr. Madoff and the directors evidencing their discussions with regard to the fact that the work that Ms. Cohen was

doing was not really work but they were manufacturing invoices to pay her.

All of this was presented to Judge Popplewell in July when we actually tried this case. I did not try it.

Our again Pushpinder Saini, our barrister, tried that case on behalf of the trustee, assisted by Williams -- assisted by I should say Taylor Wessing, as the solicitors.

so there's been a great deal of activity there mostly in the form of discovery and trial preparation during the reporting period which culminated, as I say, in a trial, the judge reserved decision.

Judge Popplewell has indicated that we will next week get a what they call a preliminary decision. We get to comment on it, not substantively, but whether he's got all the facts right and the grammar looks right, and then we give that back and we should have a decision within the next ten days.

They've also assisted us as I say Kinggate we've sued Suretti & Grosso, we're pursuing them in England as well in Bermuda and BDI and the Caymans -- or BDI I should say.

So there's a lot of activity in the United Kingdom, which is why you have the amount of time there.

UGGC you'll see that the time has gone up, it's over 400 hours. This is in France.

What has happened there is, is that initially the prosecutor in France, a number of -- let me just back up a step. A number of the investors that went through the Luxsolfa (ph) and what we call the Luxembourg funds actually are out in France, and it was initially an investigation by the prosecutor, but he shut it down.

And quite frankly we've gone over there and we've talked to the prosecutor and he's reopened the investigation.

And Soretti & Grosso by the way have gone in because there's also a part of this and tried to shut it down.

So we have active litigation going on in French courts with us pursuing discovery there through the French prosecutor assisting them with discovery that we have, again, a very unique system.

We're confident that the courts will allow us to proceed and that they will deny Soretti & Grosso's application to shut down our participation, which is what they're trying to do.

The prosecutor is supporting it, wants us involved, and I think it will continue.

Again, this is not in support of any particular action in France so much as to develop evidence and documents with regard to the activities of Sonja Cohen and

Pg 23 of 36 Page 23 other, you know, participants in the fraud like Soretti & Grosso in Europe. Then we have Gibraltar. THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Sheehan. At the end of the day with all the activity surrounding Sonja Cohen is it possible that it's a dry well? MR. SHEEHAN: You know, well, we've actually frozen about \$25 million. Now I realize in the scheme of things in this case that's not a lot of money, but it is still a lot of money and there is -- you know, we've traced a good deal of the money - and you haven't seen this counsel here yet -- but to Australia. And most of the money is there in the hands of her children and her mother, who's still alive. So we're pursuing that at this point trying to work it out through her counsel, and they've been somewhat cooperative, and we think that once we have the judgment, which we anticipate we will get in England, we'll get much more cooperation from them. Right now we haven't had the cooperation that we've expected, although we've had many conferences and worked with them. But I do believe that there is ultimately nine figures that will be available to the trustee, which

justifies all this activity.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And in addition what we're finding is this. Is that just as a general observation. While all of the individuals that we sued would suggest to you in their defenses that we didn't know anything, how were we supposed to find out, the SEC couldn't figure it out, how were we, and we were in isolation, we didn't know anything? What we're actually finding is we continue to develop everyone of these individuals was talking to one another and they actually knew one another and they actually cooperated with one another. They introduced each other to different funds.

So this is not really just one case against

Ms. Cohen, it's actually a case that manifested itself in

Soretti & Grosso, for example, in the Kinggate funds, we're

seeing evidence of them there. We see them in other funds

that are offshore. All of them were offshore, as Your Honor

knows.

So we're finding that as we continue this discovery the closeness of all these individuals gets tighter and tighter.

So it's not just a question of pursuing assets, and we've obviously had some success in that and we'll continue, but I believe also what we're doing is we're tying together and ticking and tying so much information that just makes the credibility of our case that much stronger.

Then Gibraltar what we have there is, Your Honor,

this has been long running probably from the very beginning, you'll recall that we found \$150 million sitting in bank accounts there for Biskia (ph) and related funds.

What we've done there is we've frozen those funds, and then as Your Honor will recall, with your assistance, we convinced our adversaries of the value of our default, so they -- the money has actually been transferred to this court and ultimately that trial will take place here.

In the meantime we have other defendants there and other monies that we're pursuing and we're seeking to enforce the default judgment, which Your Honor entered here.

Most recently the courts in Gibraltar agreed to Enforce, that notwithstanding any recent Rubin decision would seem to suggest otherwise, we were very successful. That case is on appeal now, it was actually just argued this week. So we're hoping that we will ultimately be successful with the appellate body.

The reports I have is that, although you can't forecast a result, that our arguments went very well and were well received by the panel, so we're very hopeful that in Gibraltar we're actually get really good law for us, that would be very helpful in other cases where we can take defaults and pursue them throughout the commonwealth.

Then we have Switzerland, that's very small. That was the deposition that I eluded to earlier in connection

with Magnify. Took the deposition of an individual there who was the lawyer who created the Shasia Horowitz and the Magnify connection.

And then last that I'm going to report on here this morning is Browne Jacobson with over 400 hours.

They're our conflict counsel, for wont of a better term, in the United Kingdom. Taylor Wessing is a major international law firm. Unfortunately we've run into several conflicts with the wide reach of the Madoff case.

So Browne Jacobson has come in, they've worked with us on a number of matters, not the -- obviously the Sonja Cohen matter -- but we've had other causes of action there that we're pursuing in connection with Soretti & Grosso as I've said.

They've also been our principal bankruptcy counsel there. It's not one of the strong suits, to be blunt, of Taylor Wessing, but the Browne Jacobson people have been very, very good there and we've worked with Blackstone Chambers as our barrister in connection with those efforts.

So that is a brief summary and overview, Your Honor, of what we've been doing at least in the reporting period and continuing to do today.

In addition to that of course we have, as I mentioned earlier, our counsel here today --

THE COURT: Before we get to that I just have

Page 27 1 one --2 MR. SHEEHAN: Sure, Your Honor. THE COURT: -- inquiry based just on the numbers. 3 Taylor Wessing is approaching six million and 4 5 their expenses are half again the amount of their fees. 6 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: That seems to be somewhat 8 disproportionate. 9 MR. SHEEHAN: Yes, and there is an explanation. 10 THE COURT: Please. 11 MR. SHEEHAN: And the explanation is that the 12 barristers there are treated as an expense, so when you see 13 the expenses that expense is for Pushpinder Saini, and they 14 charge it to us as an expense. 15 Barristers don't bill the way that we do here in 16 the States, they bill with -- to the solicitor, the 17 solicitor bills us, it's treated as an expense. 18 THE COURT: So the fees essentially are really closer to nine million than --19 20 MR. SHEEHAN: Correct, Your Honor. That's 21 correct. 22 As I was about to say there's two other firms here 23 this morning that I want to speak about before I get to our 24 own firm, and that is Windels Marx and Young Conaway. 25 And as Your Honor knows the history very, very

well about Windels' involvement in the case, they've been actively involved in assisting us and have done, as I've said in the past and continues to date, superb work in supporting the efforts of the trustee in recovering assets from many, many defendants. It's an ongoing activity, continuing even as we speak today, in a matter that will be mediated this afternoon.

So this is a firm that has been in the forefront with us throughout this process and has done exemplary work.

Along the way of course they themselves developed conflicts, again given the wide reach of Madoff, and we brought Young Conaway in who has been again very, very helpful to us and assisted us in any number of matters which are reported on in our interim report.

Then last but not least of course there is the Baker Hostetler application, which is as I said at the outset, our twelfth interim application.

We've submitted a very extensive application as well as we've submitted an interim report to Your Honor in the past over the course of this proceeding. I'm not going to get into detail. We appear regularly in front of Your Honor, you're aware of what has transpired over the last four and a half years, and certainly specifically during this reporting period.

So at this point, Your Honor, given the fact

there's no opposition, I would ask and move that all of these applications be approved by Your Honor.

THE COURT: Does anyone want to be heard?

MR. BELL: Yes, Your Honor. Kevin Bell on behalf

5 of Securities Investor Protection Corporation.

I want to thank Your Honor for taking my first point, that was Taylor Wessing, because the extraordinary number of hours and the millions of dollars of expenses I was going to address it but Your Honor raised the question and Mr. Sheehan asked that we at SIPC had been very vigilant in looking at international counsel and the extraordinary number of hours and the expenses, and I want to thank

Mr. Sheehan for clarifying on the record that Blankstone

Chambers' charges as the barrister are included in those expenses, and SIPC has been very vigilant in monitoring those and reviewing them and commenting on them and getting adjustments.

As to all the others, Young Conaway, Greenfield, Wendels, and Baker, again, this is a no asset case. SIPC takes the responsibility of monitoring these very seriously, and as you will see that monitoring continues even after the applications are filed, and there was a further adjustment with regard to Baker's application, which is noted in the SIPC recommendation. And I just wanted to make sure that I note to the Court that there is an adjustment that was made

after Baker filed, which is noted in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the SIPC recommendation on Baker -- Baker Hostetler's application.

Again, it's a no asset case, the SIPA statutory provision says that in a no asset case the Court is required to accept SIPC's recommendation where the numbers agree.

Baker has agreed with our further adjustment, but I believe that even if there were -- this was a no asset case and the Court went through its normal processes that I feel confident the Court would look at SIPC's recommendation and instead of taking it as a mandatory acceptance would find that the oversight that we've looked at and the results where we've come to with Wendels, Taylor Wessing, and Baker would be exactly where the Court would come.

This is a massive case, and as Mr. Sheehan's explanation shows everything is connected. And, you know, when you get to Magnify and Israel you wind up with one of the good faith actions in France. Same person set up both entities.

So you watch the connections, you watch Ms. Cohen wandering through even a new jurisdiction, Australia, and I'm sure we'll be recommending to the Court a retention of a special counsel down under, and you know, there are more aspects of this case coming forward.

THE COURT: I predict you may end up possibly in

New Zealand as well.

MR. BELL: Maybe Popular New Guinea, who knows.

But somewhere down in that area of the world. If she's in one country we have found Ms. Cohen winds up popping up other places. It's like whack a mole.

But to get back to the matter at hand, we, SIPC, recommends strongly that this Court approve these fees and we thank the Court for its time.

MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, if I may, just one thing I did overlook that Mr. Bell reminded me of it.

There is a reduction that took place. After we Filed, had further discussions with SIPC, and we effectuated further reductions to the specific month of April, and the reduction is in the amount of \$33,572.70 in fees, and in disbursements, \$1,112.91. That has been reflected in the order that I prepared and can submit to Your Honor this morning.

THE COURT: Does anyone else want to be heard?

Well, as in everything in this case the scale is incredibly broad, both with respect to the worldwide implications and jurisdictions, which bring a huge amount of jurisdictional complexity, territorial push back on the part of the -- I can't even say hundreds -- I presume we're even getting into potentially thousands of parties who have an incentive to push back, and we're on a scale of beyond

billions that are involved here.

The efforts by the trustee and counsel here have been -- I won't say happily -- have been substantially productive.

I don't know how long it's going to take to wind everything down, but certainly we're getting into a more hardball of viewability of where some ultimate economic resolution can take place on the part of all the parties that are involved.

Somewhere along the line everybody is going to be having to say enough is enough, we've spent enough, but nevertheless, when we are dealing with such a high amount of billions and we're also dealing in a situation where this is not a traditional bankruptcy estate where the estate itself suffers the expense of all the fees SIPC under 78(b)(5) and so forth puts the Court in the position of almost being required to approve the fees that are requested and provided that its convinced it's been appropriate oversight by SIPC.

I am absolutely convinced that that is the case here.

There does not appear to be any chance at this point in time for recovery of the fees that have been laid out so far.

So under the circumstances and as before the Court will follow the statute which says must, but I agree with

counsel for SIPC, that if you took an overall look at the amount of work that's been put in, the recoveries that have been had so far, and the potential for many more recoveries coming forward that the fees that are requested are definitely not out of line.

I'm also aware that the new period coming up is probably going to be as heavy as the one we've just seen because of all the very heavy activity both here in the United States and in other jurisdictions where decisions both pro and adverse are continuing to be litigated and appealed with interesting kinds of reactions and success.

I'm also aware that based upon some of the decisions that have come down recently that there's going to be a new flurry of litigation here before me, and certainly my opinion that is now on its way up to the circuit, I hope, on the time value of money will generate even more activity here.

So it's unfortunate that this case is really becoming such a huge case for generation of fees, but hopefully they, as opposed to many other situations, will reflect on recoveries to victims and those entitled to a recovery alike as opposed I understand to some of the other Ponzi cases that are winding their way where many, many millions of dollars of fees are generated with very little results for that.

Page 34 The applications are approved. MR. SHEEHAN: Your Honor, may I approach with the order? THE COURT: Sure. THE COURT: I've approved the order. MR. SHEEHAN: Thank you very much, Your Honor. MR. BELL: Your Honor, thank you. (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 10:17 AM) 

Page 36 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Dawn South, certify that the foregoing transcript is a 4 true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Digitally signed by Dawn South Dawn DN: cn=Dawn South, o, ou, email=digital1@veritext.com, 6 South Date: 2013.10.18 12:40:07 -04'00' 7 AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET\*\*D-408 8 9 10 Veritext 11 200 Old Country Road 12 Suite 580 13 Mineola, NY 11501 14 15 October 17, 2013 Date: 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25